| BOX # | Name | Description |
|-------|-------------------------------------|--|
| 7 | Data valid? | This box represents a decision based on the validity of the Request |
| 7A | Complete "Deny" | If no to "Data valid" (Box 7), then the OSP prepares a Response that |
| | Response | includes a reason and remark as to why the Response is being denied |
| 7B | Complete "Accept" | If yes to "Data valid" (Box 7), then the OSP prepares a Response that |
| | Response | indicates acceptance. |
| 8 | Edit & format | The OICP edits the Response and formats the request into the proper |
| - | Response | record format. This Response was either fed into the OICP or |
| | • | entered directly into the OICP. |
| 9 | Store & transmit | The OICP stores the Response and then transmits it to the NSP |
| | Response | according to the routing information |
| 10 | Revd transmit | The OICP contains functionality that will verify the NICP receipt of |
| | Confirm? | the transmission of the Response. This is to ensure that transactions |
| | | are complete between the NSP and the OSP. This box represents a |
| | | decision based on whether or not the NICP sent a confirmation for |
| | | the receipt of the transaction sent by the OSP. |
| 10A | OSP resolution | If no to "Revd trans. Confirm?" (Box 10), then the OSP takes steps |
| | | necessary to determine why the transmission was not received by the |
| | | NICP. |
| 10B | Continue porting | If yes to "Royd trans. Confirm?" (Box 10), then the OSP continues |
| | process | with proprietary porting processes. |
| 11 | Response rovd, edited | The NICP receives the OSP Response, confirms that receipt back to |
| | & stored | the OICP, edits the Response and stores it. |
| 12 | Response Type equals | This box represents a decision based on the type of Response |
| | C? | received from the OSP. The Response can be either C = |
| | | Confirmation, D = Delay or R = Resolution Required. |
| 12A | Check reason code & | If no, to "Response = C" (Box 12), the NSP will check for the reason |
| | remarks | code and remarks to determine the problem with the Request. |
| 12B | Continue porting | If yes to "Response = C" (Box 12) then the NSP will continue with |
| | process | their proprietary porting processes. |
| 13 | Response Type equals | This box represents a check to determine if the Response Type was |
| 13.4 | D? Reset Timer | "D" for Delay. |
| 13A | Reset 1 imer | If yes to Response Type of "D", then the timers are reset to reflect |
| 13B | Dlive | the delay. |
| 136 | Resolve | If no to Box 13, then continue with a resolution process that the NSP |
| 1.4 | David transmit | will initiate if the OSP Denies the Request. |
| 14 | Revd transmit confirm? | The NICP contains functionality that will verify the OICP receipt of the transmission of the Request. This is to ensure that transactions |
| | Contain: | are complete between the NSP and the OSP. This box represents a |
| | | decision based on whether or not the OICP sent a confirmation for |
| | | the receipt of the transaction sent by the NSP. |
| 14A | NSP resolution | If no to "Royd trans. Confirm?" (Box 14), then the NSP takes steps |
| 1-11 | .101 resolution | necessary to determine why the transmission was not received by the |
| | | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · |
| | 1 | OICP. |
| 14B | Begin time tracking | OICP. If yes to "Royd trans, Confirm?" (Box 14), then the NICP initiates |
| 14B | Begin time tracking | If yes to "Rovd trans. Confirm?" (Box 14), then the NICP initiates |
| 14B | Begin time tracking | If yes to "Royd trans. Confirm?" (Box 14), then the NICP initiates the time tracking mechanism that tracks the elapsed time during the |
| | | If yes to "Royd trans. Confirm?" (Box 14), then the NICP initiates the time tracking mechanism that tracks the elapsed time during the Intercarrier Communication Process. |
| 14B | Begin time tracking Timer expired? | If yes to "Royd trans. Confirm?" (Box 14), then the NICP initiates the time tracking mechanism that tracks the elapsed time during the Intercarrier Communication Process. The box represents the on-going time tracking that occurs during the |
| 15 | Timer expired? | If yes to "Revd trans. Confirm?" (Box 14), then the NICP initiates the time tracking mechanism that tracks the elapsed time during the Intercarrier Communication Process. The box represents the on-going time tracking that occurs during the process. |
| | | If yes to "Rcvd trans. Confirm?" (Box 14), then the NICP initiates the time tracking mechanism that tracks the elapsed time during the Intercarrier Communication Process. The box represents the on-going time tracking that occurs during the process. If the timer (Box 15) does not expire or if the timer ends due to the |
| 15 | Timer expired? | If yes to "Rcvd trans. Confirm?" (Box 14), then the NICP initiates the time tracking mechanism that tracks the elapsed time during the Intercarrier Communication Process. The box represents the on-going time tracking that occurs during the process. If the timer (Box 15) does not expire or if the timer ends due to the completion of the Intercarrier Communication Process then no action |
| 15 | Timer expired? | If yes to "Rcvd trans. Confirm?" (Box 14), then the NICP initiates the time tracking mechanism that tracks the elapsed time during the Intercarrier Communication Process. The box represents the on-going time tracking that occurs during the process. If the timer (Box 15) does not expire or if the timer ends due to the |

| BOX # | Name | Description |
|-------|-------------------------|--|
| 16 | Contact OSP & resolve | The NSP initiates proprietary process to contact the OSP to determine why the Response has not been received within the proper time frame. |
| 17 | End timer | This box represents the portion of the time tracking mechanism whereby the timer is ended when the NICP receives a Response from the OSP. |
| 18 | Cust wants to continue? | This box represents the NSP proprietary process initiated with the customer when a Resolution Required Response is received from the OSP. This could include such things as verification of customer information or notification that the MDN is not a portable number. The NSP can either end the port (END) or correct the information and resubmit the Request (Box 2). |
| | END | Represents the end of the Intercarrier Communication Process. |

4.3.1.2 Narrative for Process Flow

The process begins when a customer requests to port their telephone number to a new service provider. The NSP should gather the appropriate subscriber information to populate the Request. This includes obtaining an Authorization from the subscriber to initiate the porting process as required by company policy (Box 1). NSP should refer to the Data Elements for mandatory subscriber information.

The information gathered should be entered into the proper system, either an integrated POS or SOE system or directly into the NICP (Box 2). The data is edited and formatted according to the rules defined by the ICP (Box 3). If the edits fail, an error message will be returned to the point of data entry. The formatted record is then stored and forwarded to the proper OSP based on a table of Company Code routing information (Box 4).

The OSP receives and stores the Request. The Request is passed to the OSP's B&CC system (Box 5). When the OICP receives a Request, a Confirmation of Receipt is issued back to the NICP (Box 14). Once the NICP receives the Confirmation, the Timer is started (Box 14B). If a receipt is not received within the defined time period, the NSP initiates a resolution process (Box 14A).

The OSP validates the subscriber information contained on the Request based on proprietary processes (Box 6). A decision is made to either Deny or Accept the Request (Box 7). If the Request is invalid, the OSP populates the proper fields to indicate a Denial Response to the NSP (Box 7A). If the Request is valid, the OSP populates the proper values for indicating an Accept Response (Box 7B). The data required to issue a Response can be entered through proprietary systems or directly into the OICP.

The OICP Edits and Formats the data (Box 8) according to the Data Dictionary. If the edits fail, an error message will be returned to the point of data entry. The formatted record is stored and forwarded to the proper NSP based on a table of Company Code routing information (Box 9).

The NSP receives and stores the Response (Box 11). The Response is passed to the NSP B&CC system. When the NICP receives a Response, a Confirmation of Receipt (Box 10) is issued back to the OICP. The OSP should not start the NPAC process without confirmation from the NSP. This prevents inadvertent cancellations of port requests at the NPAC due to timing errors. When the OICP receives the Confirmation of Receipt, the OSP continues with their Porting Procedures (Box 10B). If a receipt is not received within a defined time period, the OSP initiates a resolution process (Box 10A).

| Element | Description | Validation Description |
|---------|---|-------------------------|
| | requesting the port. | |
| | Record and Location - Port Request - Field #1 Port Response - Field #1 | |
| | Derivation: | |
| | Assigned by NECA (National Exchange Carrier Association) | |
| | Conditions: | |
| | Mandatory | |
| | Values: Valid SPID value | |
| NNSP | New Network Service Provider – This information is used by the OSP in generating the subscription version create to the NPAC | 4 position Alphanumeric |
| | Record and Location - Port Request - Field #8 |) |
| | Derivation: | ! ! |
| | Assigned by NECA (National Exchange Carrier Association). Populated by the NSP | |
| | Conditions: | |
| | Mandatory | |
| | Values: Valid SPID value | |
| NPDI | Number Portability Direction Indicator. Used to indicate the direction of the port. Within the description of the Number Portability Direction Indicator, the first is the OSP and the second is the NSP. For example Value B is Wireless to Wireline. The OSP is Wireless and the NSP is Wireline. | 1 position Alphanumeric |
| | Record and Location - Port Request - Field #6 | |
| | Derivation: | |
| | NSP system | |
| | Conditions: | |
| | Mandatory | |
| | Values: Upper Case Values A = Wireless to Wireless B = Wireless to Wireline C = Wireline to Wireless | |
| NPQTY | Number Portability Quantity – Indicates the number of LNUMs involved in the request to port. | 5 position Numeric |
| | For example, if NPQTY = 3 then there must be 3 LNUMs, each associated with a unique PORTED#. | |
| | Record and Location – Port Request – Field #30 | |
| : | Port Response – Field #17 Derivation: | |

| Element | Description | Validation Description |
|---------|---|--|
| | Mandatory | |
| | Values: Alphanumeric values | |
| INIT | Initiator Identification - This field identifies the NSP representative who had the initial contact with the subscriber. | 15 position Alphanumeric |
| | Record and Location - Port Request - Field #17 | |
| | Derivation: NSP system | |
| | Conditions: Optional | |
| | Values: Alphanumeric values | |
| LNUM | Line Number – On the initial Request, consecutive numbering, starting at "1" of each telephone number or range involved in this request. On subsequent versions of the | 5 position Numeric Right justify-zero fill |
| | initial Request, the LNUM and PORTED# relationship can be changed by the NSP. When the OSP issues the Response, the LNUM and PORTED# relationship must be maintained. | |
| | Record and Location - Port Request - Field #31 Port Response - Field #18 | |
| | May be repeated with PORTED# for as many times as indicated by Number Portability Quantity. For example, if NPQTY = 3 then there must be 3 LNUMs, each associated with a unique PORTED#. | |
| | Derivation: NSP system | |
| | Conditions: | |
| | Conditional – Required for all Port Requests. Required for Port Responses when RT = C or R. Not required on the Responses when RT = D. | |
| | Values: 00001 - 99999 | |
| NAME | Name – Relates to the subscriber information. It is the end subscriber. Should be consistent with the information that was supplied to the OSP to facilitate subscriber identification. Name repeats as part of the Ported # array. | 15 position Alphanumeric |
| | Record and Location - Port Request - Field #33 | |
| | Derivation: | |
| | NSP system – subscriber information | |
| | Conditions: | |
| | Optional | |
| | Values: Alphanumeric values | |
| NLSP | New Local Service Provider – Service Provider ID (SPID) of the New Service Provider. Identifies the Service Provider | 4 position Alphanumeric |

| Element | Description | Validation Description |
|-------------|---|---------------------------|
| | Derivation: | |
| | OSP system | |
| | Conditions: | |
| | ! Mandatory | |
| | Values: Time | |
| | HH = 01 - 12 | |
| | MM = 00 - 59 XM = AM or PM | |
| CDEO NO | | 16 position Alphanumeric |
| GREQ NO | Group Request Number. Used by the NSP to relate multiple Requests generated by the NICP back to a single customer | |
| | requesting service. For example, if a customer wants to port | Use primarily for complex |
| | numbers from two different OSPs then two Requests are | ports |
| | created with two different REQ NO. The GREQ NO would tie the two Requests back to the single customer. Can be an | |
| | internal Service Order Entry or Point of Sale number. | |
| | Record and Location - Port Request - Field #16 | |
| | Derivation: | |
| | NSP system | |
| | Conditions: | |
| | Conditional - required when there are more requests related | |
| | to a single port. Values: Alphanumeric values | |
| GRESP_NO | Group Response Number - Unique number assigned by the | 20 position Alphanumeric |
| GILLOI _I.O | OSP to identify the customer requesting to port out. Used to | • |
| | tie multiple port Responses together to a single OSP | |
| | customer. | |
| | Record and Location - Port Response - Field #8 | |
| | Derivation: | |
| | OSP system | |
| | Conditions: | |
| | Mandatory | |
| | Values: Alphanumeric values | |
| IMPCON | Implementation Contact - This field identifies the NSP | 15 position Alphanumeric |
| | representative who is in control of the port. This is the name | |
| | of a NSP representative or porting center. The OSP would use this for a point of contact in resolving issues. | |
| | Record and Location - Port Request - Field #18 | |
| | | |
| | Derivation: | |
| | NSP system | |
| | Conditions: | |

| Element | Description | Validation Description |
|---------|---|--------------------------|
| | originally requested by the NSP. | MM-DD-YYYY |
| | Record and Location - Port Response - Field #15 | |
| | Derivation: | |
| | OSP system | |
| | Conditions: | |
| | Mandatory If the Due Date and Desired Due Date are not the same, then the OSP must populate the Reason Code with a value that indicates that Due Date and Time can not be met. | |
| | Values: Date with embedded dashes MM = 01 - 12 DD = 01 - 31 YYYY = 20xx | 7200 |
| DDD | Desired Due Date - This is the desired due date for the | 10 position Alphanumeric |
| | completion of the port and activation of service on the NSP system. | MM-DD-YYYY |
| | Record and Location - Port Request - Field #10 | |
| | Derivation: | |
| | NSP system | |
| | Conditions: | |
| | Mandatory | |
| | Values: Date with embedded dashes MM = 01 - 12 DD = 01 - 31 YYYY = 20xx | |
| DDT | Desired Due Time - This is the desired due time for the | 6 position Alphanumeric |
| | completion of the port and activation of service on the NSP system. | ннммхм |
| | Record and Location - Port Request - Field #11 | |
| | Derivation: | |
| | NSP system | |
| | Conditions: | |
| | Mandatory | |
| | Values: Time HH = 01-12 MM = 00 - 59 XM = AM or PM | |
| DT | Due Time – Indicates the time that the OSP can coordinate a port. This is in relationship to the Desired Due Time originally requested by the NSP | 6 position Alphanumeric |
| | Record and Location - Port Response - Field #14 | |

| Element | Description | Validation Description |
|---------|--|--------------------------------------|
| | Conditional on the request being a multi-number port. It is mandatory for the OSP to reply to a Coordinated Hot Cut request | |
| | Values: Y = Hot Cut Requested by NSP or Agreed to by OSP N = OSP Can not Coordinate Hot Cut Blank - No Coordinated Hot Cut requested | |
| CITY | City - The Billing City for the subscriber. | 35 position Alphanumeric |
| | Record and Location - Port Request - Field #23 | |
| | Derivation: | |
| | NSP system – Subscriber Information | 1 |
| | Conditions: | i |
| | Mandatory | ; ; |
| | Values: Alphanumeric values | 17 -osition Alabasumeria |
| D/TSENT | Date and Time Sent – the date and time that the request was sent from the NSP. This date and time is from the internal system. | 17 position Alphanumeric MM-DD-YYYY- |
| | Record and Location - Port Request - Field #9 | ННММХМ |
| | Derivation: | |
| | NSP system – prior to sending the request. This Date and Time changes with each new Version. | |
| | Conditions: | |
| | Mandatory | |
| | Values: Date and time with embedded dashes MM = 01 - 12 | |
| | DD = 01 - 31 | • |
| | YYYY = 20xx HH = 01 - 12 | |
| | MM = 00 - 59 | |
| | XM = AM or PM | |
| DATED | Date - Indicates the date of the Agency Authorization. | 10 position Alphanumeric |
| | Record and Location - Port Request - Field #14 | MM-DD-YYYY |
| | Derivation: | |
| | NSP system | |
| | Conditions: | |
| | Mandatory | |
| | Values: Date is embedded with dashes | |
| | MM = 01 - 12 | |
| | DD = 01 - 31 YYYY = 20xx | |
| DD | Due Date - Indicates the date that the OSP can coordinate a port. This is in relationship to the Desired Due Date | 10 position Alphanumeric |

| Element | Description | Validation Description |
|----------|--|--------------------------|
| | second address for the subscriber. | |
| | Record and Location - Port Request - Field #22 | |
| | Derivation: | |
| | NSP system | |
| | Conditions: | |
| | Optional – used for long addresses | |
| <u> </u> | Values: Alphanumeric values | |
| BILLNM | Bill Name – Relates to subscriber information. This is the Bill Name for the user or company requesting the port. It identifies the name of the end user but is not intended for directory services. | 25 position Alphanumeric |
| | Record and Location - Port Request - Field #20 | |
| | Derivation: | |
| | NSP system – subscriber information | |
| | Conditions: | |
| | Mandatory | |
| _ | Values: Alphanumeric values | |
| CD/TSENT | Confirmation of the NSP Date and Time Sent – Indicates the date and time that the OSP completed the confirmation or validation of the subscriber information. Record and Location – Port Response – Field #10 | 17 position Alphanumeric |
| | Derivation: | |
| | OSP system prior to sending the response. | |
| | Conditions: | |
| | Mandatory | |
| | Values: Date and time with embedded dashes MM = 01 - 12 DD = 01 - 31 YYYY = 20xx HH = 01 - 12 MM = 00 - 59 XM = AM or PM | |
| СНС | Coordinated Hot Cut - is a request by the NSP to ensure a coordinated effort to port all numbers on the request at the same time. | l position Alpha |
| | Record and Location - Port Request - Field #12 Port Response - Field #13 | |
| | Derivation: | |
| · | NSP and OSP system | |
| | Conditions: | |

8 Data Dictionary

| Element | Description | Validation Description |
|---------------------|---|--------------------------|
| ACCT | Account Number – Indicates the customer's account number within the OSP's internal systems. | 20 position Alphanumeric |
| | Record and Location - Port Request - Field #27 | · • |
| | Derivation: | |
| | NSP system | : |
| | Conditions: | |
| | Optional | |
| | Values: Alphanumeric values | |
| AGAUTH | Agency Authorization Status – Indicates that the NSP has the appropriate authorization from the subscriber to request the port. | 1 position Alpha |
| | Record and Location - Port Request - Field #13 | |
| | Derivation: | |
| | NSP system | |
| | Conditions: | |
| | Mandatory | |
| | Values: Y = Authorization on file | 15 position Alphanumeric |
| AUTHNM | Authorization Name – Indicates the end user who authorized the request to port the number. | 13 position Alphanumeric |
| | Record and Location - Port Request - Field #15 | |
| | Derivation: | |
| | NSP system | |
| | Conditions: | |
| | Mandatory | |
| | Values: Alphanumeric values | |
| Bill Address Line 1 | Bill Address Line 1 – This field is intended to capture the first line of the billing address. | 35 position Alphanumeric |
| | Record and Location - Port Request - Field #21 | |
| | Derivation: | |
| | NSP system | |
| | Conditions: | |
| | Mandatory | |
| | Values: Alphanumeric values | |
| Bill Address Line 2 | Bill Address Line 2 – This field is intended to capture the second line of the billing address, if needed. This is not a | 35 position Alphanumeric |

| dissatisfaction. | new table of unique service provider codes needs to be established and maintained by the industry. |
|--|--|
| Provides a solution for both high and low-tech Porting Processes | |
| Best opportunity to meet the 30-minute recommended interval for simple ports as noted in the 2 nd CTIA Report on WNP. | |
| Automated process and the ability for the service provider to set parameters and integrate into their B&CC, SOE or POS increases efficiencies when processing complex ports. | |
| Supports both facility and non-facility based service providers | |

6 Final Recommendation

The WICSG began our work by defining and agreeing on specific business requirements for an Intercarrier Communication process. The five alternatives previously established by the industry underwent an extensive analysis. It was determined that they were not best suited to the goals articulated herein in Section 4.1. Therefore, the WICSG developed a process (Alternative 6) that includes a standardized data structure, common data elements, and communication protocols providing wireless carriers the best opportunity to complete the intercarrier communication process within a reasonable interval. The sub group has also determined that this alternative provides the most benefits with the least cost or risk. While it was not a specific goal of the sub group to provide a wireline solution, it is believed that this alternative would allow future incorporation of wireline processes.

7 Open Issues

- Resellers need Company Identifiers to be used within the Intercarrier Communication Process as the means to
 route Requests and Responses. This issue needs further study. There are two possibilities for further action.
 Either the current NECA assignment guidelines need to be modified or a new industry maintained set of
 codes has to be created. The reseller pre-porting process is being addressed through the PIM (Problem Issues
 Management) process at the LNPAWG. Upon completion of that work, the wireless industry will need to
 ensure that any previously adopted processes are compatible with the reseller method.
- Prepaid poses a unique set of issues and was not specifically addressed in this Report. Prepaid is being
 addressed by the LNPAWG with a resolution expected in the 3rd Report on Wireless Wireline Integration.

| Benefit | Cost/Risk |
|---|---|
| Eliminates the cost of the LSR/FOC process. | Increased risk of slamming and customer dissatisfaction |
| | Subscriptions resulting in conflict require a manual intervention process to resolve the conflicts. Frequent resolution processing could be more costly than supporting the LSR/FOC process. |
| | Potential for extremely high conflict volumes through the NPAC |
| | Would require separate process to handle large or complex ports since this alternative does not include a step that tracks all Mobile Directory Numbers in one place. Coordination of due dates for large port requests would be difficult. |

5.6 Alternative 6 - Standardized Porting Information Telecommunication System

While its roots are based on the LSR/FOC, this alternative has a standardized common data structure for NSP Requests and OSP Responses. The required elements within the data structure apply to all service providers. There are process rules for transmitting customer information between new and old service providers. This includes certified delivery for Requests and Responses. It is a requirement for the OSP to reply to the Request with a Response.

| Benefit | Cost/Risk |
|--|--|
| Standard data elements and communication methods avoid the need for individual Service Level Agreements with each Wireless Service Provider. | Full benefits not realized without participation from all wireless service providers. |
| Automation of Intercarrier Communication process reduces manual efforts | Unknown cost of product |
| Closely resembles the wireline process | Cost of implementation, especially if integration into the service provider's own systems is desired. |
| Doesn't preclude wireline's participation with their current data structures through data mapping and conversion. | Process still allows the OSP to set individual validation rules for approving the port request that could cause conflicts. |
| Mandatory OSP Response reduces delays and conflicts. Reduces risk to slamming and customer | Lack of an industry maintained table of "company codes" that includes Resellers. Either Resellers need to be assigned company codes by NECA or a |

| Increased conflict volumes could add to the overall cost of the NPAC porting process for both Old and New Service Providers. |
|--|
| Internal New Service Provider costs could be increased due to level of processing before a conflict is received. |
| Old Service Provider only has one opportunity to conflict with porting request through the NPAC based on the current procedures. |
| Since all conflicts must now be handled through the NPAC process, new conflict codes relating to the LSR must be added to the NPAC specifications. |
| Timer is set for full 30 minutes with no ability to accelerate the process with an Old Service Provider notification of approval. |
| Possibility of increased customer dissatisfaction due to including the time delay in notification that a port is not allowed. |

5.4 Alternative 4 - Partial LSR Process/FOC for errors only.

This process is consistent with Alternative 3 except the Old Service Provider sends a FOC for conflicts or errors.

| Benefit | Cost/Risk | | | | |
|-------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|
| Reduces volume of FOCs. | Since the Old Service Provider does not send an FOC the timer is set for the full 30 minutes. No opportunity to accelerate the process. | | | | |
| | No FOC does not guarantee concurrence for the NPAC Create Order. | | | | |
| | The New Service Provider has no guarantee that the Old Service Provider received the LSR. (Add to multiple alternatives remember to add to #3, #5, and?) | | | | |

5.5 Alternative 5 - No LSR/FOC process before the NPAC process begins

In this alternative, subscriptions are sent directly to the NPAC with no prior LSR/FOC. The NPAC would be used to monitor SV create and SV concurrence messages.

| No requirement for separate wireless to wireless vs. wireless to wireline process – one process for communicating between any two service providers. | Multiple communication processes, including faxing would make it unreasonable to expect meeting the 30-minute wireless timeframe. |
|--|---|
| | The OSP has all of the control while NSP waits for the FOC. |

5.2 Alternative 2 - NANC 204

This alternative is documented in a contribution submitted as a feasibility study to Lockheed Martin CIS. It is described as a "LSR/FOC" process whereby pre-porting information validation is completed through the NPAC. (See Attachment A – need to review)

| Benefit | Cost/Risk |
|--|---|
| Eliminates the need for a direct carrier to carrier communication process. | Only Facility-Based Service Providers can use NPAC process |
| Integrates existing intercarrier communications process into the NPAC process. | Costly to make changes to the NPAC and SOA systems. |
| | No guarantee if NANC 204 would be approved. |
| | If approved, no assurances that NANC 204 could be implemented on time. |
| | Still would require a second process for wireless to wireless ports. |
| | Would still be the service provider's choice on whether or not to use the NANC 204 process. |

5.3 Alternative 3 - Partial LSR Process/No FOC

This process is described as sending a LSR to the Old Service Provider as a notification, but no FOC is allowed. The New Service Provider would then send the subscription to the NPAC after 30 minutes. The Old Service Provider will be able to determine if they provide service to the porting number and validate if it is associated to the correct customer using the LSR information. However, the Old Service Provider must then use the NPAC process to conflict if there is a problem with the LSR.

| Benefit | Cost/Risk |
|--|--|
| Cost and Procedural Savings – no effort spent sending, monitoring and validating FOCs. | Potential for high conflict volumes within the NPAC process. |

Service Providers have the option of developing a system to support the Intercarrier Communication Process or purchasing a system from a vendor. Another approach would be for a third part to facilitate the process as a transaction clearinghouse.

4.6 Industry Established Response Timelines

Current industry goals suggest 30 minutes for the completion of the Intercarrier Communication process. Included in these guidelines is leeway for additional time in the case of complex ports. However, the definition of a complex port is rather subjective at this time. See section 4.3.2.3 for more information on the definition of a complex port.

The process documented here requires the OSP to send a Response within 30-minutes even if that Response is to indicate that more time will be required to complete the validation process. This will let the NSP know that progress is being made on the Request, but that it won't be completed in time. If the OSP sends a Response indicating that more time is needed, then the OSP will be required to populate an estimated date and time when the validation will be complete. Timers and alarms within the ICP should be reset manually by the NSP to the agreed date and time.

5 Alternatives considered

The following alternatives were evaluated as possible solutions to meet the requirements for CMRS Intercarrier Communications.

5.1 Alternative 1 - Adopt Current Wireline LSR/FOC process (with modification to timers)

This LSR process does not mandate specific information or methods for exchange; therefore, individual service level agreements are required. The Old Service Provider receives the LSR and can either conflict with the request or send a concurrence, but must provide a response. After the receipt of a positive FOC or indication from the Old Service Provider that no FOC will be sent, the NPAC process can begin. If this process were adopted, it would be a requirement to modify the wireline timers to meet the wireless expectations of a 30-minute timeframe.

| Benefit | Cost/Risk |
|---|--|
| Old Service Provider has the ability to validate information and respond to the New Service Provider. | Wireline is experiencing many problems and errors with the LSR/FOC process due in part to a lack of a standard process (e.g. data elements and communication methods, etc.). |
| New Service Provider receives a response from the Old Service Provider thereby reducing NPAC conflicts. | High chance of delaying port completion if waiting for FOC. |
| New Service Provider has the ability to detect an incorrect Old Service Provider. | Method of transmitting the data will not support anticipated wireless porting volumes. |

4.4.6 Data Edits, Formatting and Transmission

Section 8 of this document is a Data Dictionary that details the valid values for all fields on both the Request and Response. A Response or Request is incomplete until all mandatory fields are completed and validated. There are three types of fields:

- Mandatory Must be completed for the Request or Response to be valid. If all mandatory fields are
 completed properly, then the Request or Response is considered valid and cannot be rejected by another
 service provider.
- Conditional Required if specific conditions have been met. The Data Dictionary defines the conditions for these types of fields.
- Optional Not required for the Request or Response to be considered valid.

Once a Request or Response is populated with all the mandatory fields, the ICP will validate the data and format it into the standardized record for transmission. It is assumed that some service providers will have APIs from their existing systems to the ICP. The intent of the edit and formatting steps is to ensure that the data is correct before it is transmitted. The ICP should take the responsibility for integrity of the data. This includes the ability to send error messages that give specific information as to the error.

Customer address information has been identified as an area where data validation could be difficult. The OSP can validate the customer address information as part of their internal processes to confirm the port Request. Different systems use different formats for entering address information. It has been suggested that the ICP contain a standardized sub-routine to convert address. This would be similar to many sub-routines used when sending a credit check request.

It is expected that the ICP include standard communication protocols to ensure Responses and Requests are sent correctly. This would include Confirmation of Receipt for the delivery of transactions between service providers. If receipt can not be confirmed, the ICP should have the ability to resend the transmission for a user-defined period of time. For example if the communication link between the New and Old service provider is down, the ICP will hold the record in a buffer, send an alarm to the sending Service Provider and continue to retry until resolution is complete.

Data should be stored and purged based on user-defined guidelines. It is understood that each Service Provider would need to determine the benefits of long-term storage as opposed to the cost of disk space. The ability to store and retrieve partial orders is considered an added benefit, but not a requirement of the system. It is a suggestion to provide record retention for 30 to 90 days.

4.5 Standard Communication Protocol

It is envisioned that the Intercarrier Communication Process will be supported by Service Providers and vendors who will develop the network and software necessary to allow the transfer of standardized Requests and Responses. It is suggested that these standardized transactions execute under the control of an object request broker (i.e., CORBA) or transaction processing management (TMP) software (i.e. BEA's Tuxedo) to handle the queuing, transactional integrity and recoverability.

In this type of architecture, each Service Provider would enable two logical network connections, a "listener" connection and a "talker" connection. Each service Provider would send port-in requests out the "talker" connection and listen for responses and port-our requests on the "listener" connection. The "talker" of one Service Provider connects with the "listener" of another. This allows the transactions to be processed asynchronously. That is each Service Provider can send porting Requests one after the other over the "talker" connection while on the "listening" connection, the Service Providers would receive Responses indicating the port had completed successfully or that it had problems.

| Field | Field # | Description | Length | Type |
|------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|----------|------|
| CC | l | Company Code - (SPID) - Local | 15-an | M |
| | | Service Provider | | |
| Primary CC Contact | 2 | Contact | 15-an | M |
| TEL NO | 3 | Telephone Number | I7-num | М |
| PAGER | 4 | Pager Number | 25-an | 0 |
| EMAIL | 5 | Electronic Mail Address | 60-an | M |
| FAX NO | 6 | Facsimile Number | 12-num | M |
| STREET | 7 | Street Address | 25-an | 0 |
| FLOOR | 8 | Floor | 4-an | 0 |
| ROOM/MAIL STOP | 9 | Room/Mail Stop | 10-an | 0 |
| CITY | 10 | City | 25-alpha | 0 |
| STATE | 11 | State/Province | 2-alpha | 0 |
| ZIP CODE | 12 | Zip Code | 10-an | 0 |
| Primary Routing Type | 13 | Type of routing | 2-an | M |
| Primary Routing | 14 | Routing Address | 30-an | M |
| Address | | | | |
| ALT CC Contract | 15 | Alternate Contact | 15-an | M |
| TEL NO (ALT) | 16 | Telephone Number | 17-num | M |
| PAGER (ALT) | 17 | Pager Number | 25-an | 0 |
| FAX NO (ALT) | 18 | Facsimile Number | 12-num | M |
| EMAIL (ALT) | 19 | Electronic Mail Address | 60-an | M |
| Secondary Routing Type | 20 | Type of routing | 2-an | M |
| Second Routing Address | 21 | Routing Address | 30-an | M |

.

| Field | Field # | Description | Length | Type | Sample Value |
|-------------|---------|--|---------|------|-----------------------------|
| | | Network Service Provider | | | |
| REQ_NO | 4 | Request Number | 16-an | M | 1234 |
| VER ID REQ | 5 | Version Identification for the Request | 2-ал | M | blank |
| VER ID RESP | 6 | Version Identification for the Response | 2-an | С | blank |
| RT | 7 | Response Type | 1-alpha | М | R |
| RESP_NO | 8 | Response Number | 20-an | M | |
| GRESP_NO | 9 | Group Response Number | 18-an | С | 45678 |
| CD/TSENT | 10 | Confirmation Date and Time Sent | 17-an | М | 11-05- 20001145AM |
| REP | 11 | Provider Contact Representative | 15-an | M | J. Represent |
| TEL NO | 12 | Telephone Number | 12-num | M | 409-777-9876 |
| CHC | 13 | Coordinated Hot Cut | l-alpha | С | blank |
| DT | 14 | Due Time | 6-an | M | 0130PM |
| DD | 15 | Due Date | 10-an | M | 11-05-2000 |
| TNQTY | 16 | Telephone Number Quantity | 6-num | М | 3 |
| NPQTY | 17 | Number Portability Quantity | 5-num | M | 3 |
| LNUM | 18 | Line Number corresponds to LNUM on original Request from NSP | 5-num | М | 00001 |
| PORTED # | 19 | Porting Telephone Number | 17-an | M | 409-696-1234 |
| RCODE | 20 | Reason Code | 2-an | С | 6A |
| RDET | 21 | Reason Code Detail | 60-an | С | Customer name doesn't match |
| LNUM | 18 | Line Number corresponds to LNUM on original Request from NSP | 5-num | М | 00002 |
| PORTED# | 19 | Porting Telephone Number (repeats) | 17-an | M | 409-696-1235 |
| RCODE | 20 | Reason Code | 2-an | С | blank |
| RDET | 21 | Reason Code Detail | 60-an | С | blank |
| LNUM | 18 | Line Number corresponds to LNUM on original Request from NSP | 5-num | М | 00003 |
| PORTED# | 19 | Porting Telephone Number | 17-an | М | 409-696-1236 |
| RCODE | 20 | Reason Code | 2-an | С | blank |
| RDET | 21 | Reason Code Detail | 60-an | С | blank |
| REMARKS | 22 | Remarks | 160-an | 0 | |

4.4.5 Routing & Contact Information

This table contains the contact and routing information for all local service carriers with whom a service provider has porting agreements. The table contains information necessary to contact and route Requests and Responses to the proper service provider. At least 2 types of routing information should be contained in this table to provide alternatives if a problem occurs with the primary route. Unlike the Request and Response fields and records, the Routing and Contact Information record can be unique to each service provider or vendor. The key point is to ensure that records are routed correctly between each service provider quickly and efficiently. Therefore, the fields below are a suggestion and have not been included in the Data Dictionary.

| Field | Field # | Description | Length | Type | Sample Value |
|-------------|---------|--|---------|------|----------------------|
| | | Local Service Provider | | | |
| ONSP | 3 | Company Code (SPID) - for the Old Network Service Provider | 4-an | M | AWS |
| REQ_NO | 4 | Request Number | l6-an | M | 1234 |
| VER ID REQ | 5 | Version Identification for the Request | 2-an | М | blank |
| VER ID RESP | 6 | Version Identification for the Response | 2an | С | blank |
| RT | 7 | Response Type | l-alpha | М | С |
| RESP_NO | 8 | Response Number | 20-an | M | 98765 |
| GRESP_NO | 9 | Group Response Number | 18-an | М | 45678 |
| CD/TSENT | 10 | Confirmation Date and Time Sent | 17-an | М | 11-05- 20001145AM |
| REP | 11 | Provider Contact Representative | 15-an | M | J. Represent |
| TEL NO | 12 | Telephone Number | 12-num | М | 409-777-9876 |
| CHC | 13 | Coordinated Hot Cut | l-alpha | С | blank |
| DT | 14 | Due Time | 6-an | M · | 0130PM |
| DD | 15 | Due Date | 10-an | М | 11-05-2000 |
| INQTY | 16 | Telephone Number Quantity | 6-num | М | 3 |
| NPQTY | 17 | Number Portability Quantity | 5-num | М | 3 |
| LNUM | 18 | Line Number corresponds to LNUM on original Request from NSP (repeats) | 5-num | М | 00001 |
| PORTED# | 19 | Porting Telephone Number (repeats) | 17-an | M | 409-696-1234 |
| RCODE | 20 | Reason Code | 2-an | С | blank |
| RDET | 21 | Reason Code Detail | 60-an | С | blank |
| LNUM | 18 | Line Number corresponds to LNUM on original Request from NSP (repeats) | 5-num | М | 00002 |
| PORTED# | 19 | Porting Telephone Number (repeats) | 17-an | M | 409-696-1235 |
| RCODE | 20 | Reason Code | 2-an | С | blank |
| RDET | 21 | Reason Code Detail | 60-an | С | blank |
| LNUM | 18 | Line Number corresponds to LNUM on original Request from NSP (repeats) | 5-num | М | 00003 |
| PORTED# | 19 | Porting Telephone Number (repeats) | 17-an | М | 409-696-1236 |
| RCODE | 20 | Reason Code | 2-an | С | blank |
| RDET | 21 | Reason Code Detail | 60-an | С | blank |
| REMARKS | 22 | Remarks | 160-an | 0 | |

The following is a sample Deny Response Request for Multi-line Port. Note that fields 17 - 21 repeat. In this example, only one of the numbers in the Request to port requires resolution by the NSP.

| Field | Field # | Description | Length | Type | Sample Value |
|-------|---------|--|--------|------|--------------|
| NLSP | 1 | Company Code (SPID) - for New Local Service Provider | 4-an | М | PCS |
| OLSP | 2 | Company Code (SPID) - for Old Local Service Provider | 4-an | M | AWS |
| ONSP | 3 | Company Code (SPID) - for the Old | 4-an | M | AWS |

| Field | Field # | Description | Length | Туре | Sample Value |
|---------------------|---------|---|---------|------|-----------------------|
| REQ_NO | 3 | Request Number | 16-an | М | 1234 |
| VER ID REQ | 4 | Version Identification | 2-an | С | Blank |
| SUP | 5 | Supplement Type | l-num | С | |
| NPDI | 6 | Number Portability Direction Indicator | 1-alpha | М | A |
| RESP_NO | 7 | Response Number | 18 -an | С | Blank |
| NNSP | 8 | New Network Service provider | 4-an | M | PCS |
| D/TSENT | 9 | Date and Time Sent | I7-an | М | 11-05-2000- 1150AM |
| DDD | 10 | Desired Due Date | 10-an | M | 11-05-2000 |
| DDT | 11 | Desired Due Time | 6-an | M | 0130PM |
| CHC | 12 | Coordinated Hot Cut | l-alpha | С | Blank |
| AGAUTH | 13 | Agency Authorization Status | i-alpha | М | Y |
| DATED | 14 | Date of Agency Authorization | 10-an | M | 11-05-2000 |
| AUTHNM | 15 | Authorization Name | 15-an | М | J. Customer |
| GREQ_NO | 16 | Group Request Number | 16-an | С | |
| INIT | 17 | Initiator Identification (creator) | 15-an | 0 | Terry |
| IMPCON | 18 | Implementation Contact | 15-an | М | Lori |
| TEL NO (IMPCON) | 19 | Telephone Number | 17-num | M | 409-777-9876-333 |
| BILLNM | 20 | Bill Name (Responsible Party) | 25-an | M | J. Customer |
| Bill Address Line 1 | 21 | Street Address | 35-an | М | P.O. Box 1234 |
| Bill Address Line 2 | 22 | Street Address 2 | 35-an | 0 | |
| CITY | 23 | City | 35-an | M | Kansas City |
| STATE | 24 | State/Province | 2-an | М | KS |
| ZIP CODE | 25 | Zip Code | 10-an | М | 12345-1234 |
| SSN | 26 | Social Security Number | l l-an | 0 | |
| ACCT | 27 | Account Number | 20-an | 0 | |
| PSWD/PIN | 28 | Password/Pin Number | 15-an | 0 | |
| TNQTY | 29 | Telephone Number Quantity | 6-num | М | 3 |
| NPQTY | 30 | Number Portability Quantity | 5-num | М | 00003 |
| LNUM | 31 | Line Number | 5-num | М | 00001 |
| PORTED# | 32 | Porting Telephone Number | 17-num | M | 409-696-1234 |
| NAME | 33 | End Subscriber | 15-an | М | J. Customer |
| LNUM | 28 | Line Number | 5-num | М | 00002 |
| PORTED# | 29 | Ported Telephone Number | 17-num | M | 409-696-1235 |
| NAME | 33 | End Subscriber | 15-an | 0 | J. Customer |
| LNUM | 28 | Line Number | 5-num | М | 00003 |
| PORTED# | 29 | Ported Telephone Number | 17-num | М | 409-696-1236 |
| NAME | 33 | End Subscriber | 15-an | М | J. Customer |
| REMARKS | 34 | Remarks | 160 | 0 | RUSH |

The following is a sample Confirmation Response Record for Multi-line Port. Note that fields 18 - 21 repeat.

| Field | Field # | Description | Length | Type | Sample Value |
|-------|---------|--|--------|------|--------------|
| NLSP | 1 | Company Code (SPID) - for New Local Service Provider | 4-an | M | PCS |
| OLSP | 2 | Company Code (SPID) - for Old | 4-an | M | AWS |

| Field | Field # | Description | Length | Type | Sample Value |
|-------------|---------|---|---------|------|--|
| NLSP | j | Company Code (SPID) - for New Local Service Provider | 4-an | М | PCS |
| OLSP | 2 | Company Code (SPID) - for Old Local Service Provider | 4-an | M | AWS |
| ONSP | 3 | Company Code (SPID) - for the Old Network Service Provider | 4-an | M | AWS |
| REQ_NO | 4 | Request Number | 16-an | M | 1234 |
| VER ID REQ | 5 | Version Identification for the Request | 2-an | M | blank |
| VER ID RESP | 6 | Version Identification for the Response | 2an | С | blank |
| RT | 7 | Response Type | i-aipha | M | J |
| GRESP_NO | 8 | Group Response Number | 20-an | М | |
| RESP_NO | 9 | Response Number | 18-an | М | 45678 |
| CD/TSENT | 10 | Confirmation Date and Time Sent | 17-an | М | 11-05- 20001145AM |
| REP | 11 | Provider Contact Representative | 15-an | М | J. Represent |
| TEL NO | 12 | Telephone Number | 12-num | М | 409-777-1234 |
| CHC | 13 | Coordinated Hot Cut | l-alpha | С | blank |
| DT | 14 | Due Time | 6-an | М | 0430PM |
| DD | 15 | Due Date | 10-an | М | 11-05-2000 |
| TNQTY | 16 | Telephone Number Quantity | 6-num | M | 1 |
| NPQTY | 17 | Number Portability Quantity | 5-num | M | 1 |
| LNUM | 18 | Line Number corresponds to LNUM on original Request from NSP | 5-num | С | |
| PORTED # | 19 | Ported Telephone Number | 17-an | С | |
| RCODE | 20 | Reason Code | 2-an | С | 6H |
| RDET | 21 | Reason Code Detail | 60-an | Ċ | Network Upgrade will delay validation of request |
| REMARKS | 22 | Remarks | 160-an | 0 | |

4.4.4 Sample Data Elements Needed for a Multi-line Port

As in the previous section (4.4.3) this section includes a sample of a Request to port multiple numbers along with samples of Confirmation and Resolution Required Response. The major difference between the single and multiple line number forms is the ability to repeat specific fields regarding the porting number in the Request and Response. A sample Delay Response is not included here since there are no significant differences from the example shown in the previous section.

The following is a sample Request Form for Multi-line Port. Note that fields 2831-33 repeat the number of times equal to the value in the Number Portability Quantity field (field # 27).

| Field | Field # | Description | Length | Туре | Sample Value |
|-------|---------|---|--------|------|--------------|
| NLSP | 1 | Company Code (SPID) - for New Local Service Provider | 4-an | М | PCS |
| OLSP | 2 | Company Code (SPID) - for Old Local Service Provider | 4-an | М | AWS |

| Field | Field # | Description | Length | Type | Sample Value |
|----------|---------|--|--------|------|--------------|
| TNQTY | 16 | Telephone Number Quantity | 6-num | М | 1 |
| NPQTY | 17 | Number Portability Quantity | 5-num | M | 1 |
| LNUM | 18 | Line Number corresponds to LNUM on original Request from NSP | 5-num | C | 00001 |
| PORTED # | 19 | Porting Telephone Number | 17-an | С | 409-696-1234 |
| RCODE | 20 | Reason Code | 2-an | С | blank |
| RDET | 21 | Reason Code Detail | 60-an | С | blank |
| REMARKS | 22 | Remarks | 160-an | 0 | |

Sample of a Resolution Required Response for a Single Port.

| Field | Field # | Description | Length | Type | Sample Value |
|-------------|---------|---|---------|------|---|
| NLSP | 1 | Company Code (SPID) - NANP for New Local Service Provider | 4-an | M | PCS |
| OLSP | 2 | Company Code (SPID) - for Old Local Service Provider | 4-an | M | AWS |
| ONSP | 3 | Company Code (SPID) - for the Old Network Service Provider | 4-an | М | AWS |
| REQ_NO | 4 | Request Number | 16-an | M | 1234 |
| VER ID REQ | 5 | Version Identification for the Request | 2-an | M | blank |
| VER ID RESP | 6 | Version Identification for the Response | 3-an | С | blank |
| RT | 7 | Response Type | l-alpha | M | R |
| GRESP_NO | 8 | Group Response Number | 20-an | С | |
| RESP_NO | 9 | Response Number | 18-an | M | 45678 |
| CD/TSENT | 10 | Confirmation Date and Time Sent | 17-an | M | 11-05- 20001145AM |
| REP | 11 | Provider Contact Representative | 15-an | M | J. Represent |
| TEL NO | 12 | Telephone Number | 12-num | M | 409-777-1234 |
| CHC | 13 | Coordinated Hot Cut | l-alpha | С | blank |
| DT | 14 | Due Time | 6-an | M | 0130PM |
| DD | 15 | Due Date | 10-an | M | 11-05-2000 |
| TNQTY | 16 | Telephone Number Quantity | 6-num | M | 1 |
| NPQTY | 17 | Number Portability Quantity | 5-num | М | 1 |
| LNUM | 18 | Line Number corresponds to LNUM on original Request from NSP | 5-num | С | 00001 |
| PORTED# | 19 | Porting Telephone Number | 17-an | C | 409-696-1234 |
| RCODE | 20 | Reason Code | 2-an | С | 6A |
| RDET | 21 | Reason Code Detail | 60-an | C | Customer Name does not match telephone number |
| REMARKS | 22 | Remarks | 160-an | 0 | |

Sample of a Timing Delay Response for a Single Port. Response Type is populated with a "D". A Delay Response should only be used when the OSP is encountering circumstances such as a complex port, system outage, or high volumes. Due date and Due Time have been updated with the time that the OSP will be able to validate and return a Response. Note that in this Response the LNUM and PORTED# fields are not populated. These fields are conditional and not required when the Response Type is for Delay.

| Field | Field # | Description | Length | Type | Sample Value |
|---------------------|---------|------------------------------------|---------|------|---------------|
| DDT | 11 | Desired Due Time | 6-an | M | 0130PM |
| CHC | 12 | Coordinated Hot Cut | l-alpha | C | blank |
| AGAUTH | 13 | Agency Authorization Status | l-alpha | M | Y |
| DATED | 14 | Date of Agency Authorization | 10-an | M | 11-05-2000 |
| AUTHNM | 15 | Authorization Name | 15-an | М | J. Customer |
| GREQ_NO | 16 | Group Request Number | 16-an | С | |
| INIT | 17 | Initiator Identification (creator) | 15-an | 0 | Terry: |
| IMPCON | 18 | Implementation Contact | 15-an | M | Lori |
| TEL NO (IMPCON) | 19 | Telephone Number | 17-num | M | 409-777-9876 |
| BILLNM | 20 | Bill Name (Responsible Party) | 25-an | М | J. Customer |
| Bill Address Line 1 | 21 | Street Address | 35-an | М | P.O. Box 1234 |
| Bill Address Line 2 | 22 | Street Address 2 | 35-an | 0 | |
| CITY | 23 | City | 35-an | М | Kansas City |
| STATE | 24 | State/Province | 2-an | M | KS |
| ZIP CODE | 25 | Zip Code | 10-an | M | 12345-1234 |
| SSN | 26 | Social Security Number | ll-an | 0 | |
| ACCT | 27 | Account Number | 20-an | 0 | |
| PSWD/PIN | 28 | Password/Pin Number | 15-an | 0 | |
| TNQTY | 29 | Telephone Number Quantity | 6-num | M | 1 |
| NPQTY | 30 | Number Portability Quantity | 5-num | M | 00001 |
| LNUM | 31 | Line Number | 5-num | M | 00001 |
| PORTED# | 32 | Ported Telephone Number | 17-num | М | 409-696-1234 |
| NAME | 33 | End Subscriber | 15-an | 0 | J. Customer |
| REMARKS | 34 | Remarks | 160 | 0 | RUSH |

Sample Confirmation Response for a single port.

| Field | Field # | Description | Length | Type. | Sample Value |
|-------------|---------|---|---------|-------|----------------------|
| NLSP | 1 | Company Code (SPID) - for New Local Service Provider | 4-an | М | PCS |
| OLSP | 2 | Company Code (SPID) - for Old Local Service Provider | 4-an | M | AWS |
| ONSP | 3 | Company Code (SPID) - for the Old Network Service Provider | 4-an | М | AWS |
| REQ_NO | 4 | Request Number | 16-an | M | 1234 |
| VER ID REQ | 5 | Version Identification for the Request | 2-an | M | blank |
| VER ID RESP | 6 | Version Identification for the Response | 2-an | С | blank |
| RT | 7 | Response Type | l-alpha | M | С |
| GRESP_NO | 8 | Group Response Number | 20-an | С | |
| RESP_NO | 9 | Response Number | 18-an | М | 45678 |
| CD/TSENT | 10 | Confirmation Date and Time Sent | 17-an | М | 11-05- 20001145AM |
| REP | 11 | Provider Contact Representative | 15-an | M | J. Represent |
| TEL NO | 12 | Telephone Number | 12-num | М | 409-777-1234 |
| CHC | 13 | Coordinated Hot Cut | l-alpha | С | blank |
| DT | 14 | Due Time | 6-an | M | 0130PM |
| DD | 15 | Due Date | 10-an | М | 11-05-2000 |

| Field | Field # | Description | Length | Туре | Data Source |
|---------------------------|---------|------------------------------------|---------|------|-------------|
| | | Network Service provider | | | |
| D/TSENT | 9 | Date and Time Sent | 17-an | М | SYSTEM |
| DDD | 10 | Desired Due Date | 10-an | М | NSP |
| DDT | 11 | Desired Due Time | 6-an | М | NSP |
| CHC | 12 | Coordinated Hot Cut | 1-alpha | C | NSP |
| AGAUTH | 13 | Agency Authorization Status | l-alpha | М | NSP |
| DATED | 14 | Date of Agency Authorization | 10-an | M | NSP |
| AUTHNM | 15 | Authorization Name | 15-an | М | NSP |
| GREQ_NO | 16 | Group Request Number | 16-an | C | NSP |
| INIT | 17 | Initiator Identification (creator) | 15-an | М | SYSTEM |
| IMPCON | 18 | Implementation Contact | 15-an | M | NSP |
| TEL NO (IMPCON) | 19 | Telephone Number | 17-num | М | NSP |
| BILLNM | 20 | Bill Name | 25-an | M | NSP |
| BILL ADDRESS LINE 1 | 21 | Street Address | 35-an | М | NSP |
| BILL ADDRESS LINE 2 | 22 | Street Address 2 | 35-an | 0 | NSP |
| CITY | 23 | City | 35-an | M | NSP |
| STATE | 24 | State/Province | 2-an | M | NSP |
| ZIP CODE | 25 | Zip Code | 10-an | M | NSP |
| SSN | 26 | Social Security Number | l i-an | 0 | NSP |
| ACCT | 27 | Account Number | 20-an | 0 | NSP |
| PSWD/PIN | 28 | Password/PIN | 15-an | 0 | NSP |
| TNQTY | 29 | Telephone Number Quantity | 6-num | М | NSP |
| NPQTY | 30 | Number Portability Quantity | 5-num | М | NSP |
| LNUM | 31 | Line Number | 5-num | M | SYSTEM |
| PORTED# | 32 | Porting Telephone Number | 17-num | M | NSP |
| NAME | 33 | End Subscriber | 15-an | 0 | NSP |
| REMARKS | 34 | Remarks | 160-an | 0 | NSP |

4.4.2 Porting Response Record

The Porting Response Record is used by the OSP to send either a Confirm, Resolution Required or Delay Response back to the NSP. In the table below, when "OSP" is specified as the Data Source, it is assumed that the information will be manually entered into the OICP. When the Data Source is "OICP", it is assumed that the information is derived from the port request, provided by the NSP. When the Data Source is "SYSTEM", it is assumed that the OICP will generate the required information.

| Field | Field # | Description | Length | Type | Data Source |
|-------|---------|-------------------------------------|--------|------|-------------|
| NLSP | 1 | Company Code (SPID) - for New Local | 4-an | M | OICP |

| Field | Field # | Description | Length | Type | Data Source |
|-------------|----------|---|---------|------|-------------|
| | | Service Provider | | | |
| OLSP | 2 | Company Code (SPID) - for Old Local | 4-an | М | OICP |
| | | Service Provider | | | |
| ONSP | 3 | Company Code (SPID) - for the Old | 4-an | М | OSP |
| | <u> </u> | Network Service Provider | | | |
| REQ_NO | 4 | Request Number | 16-an | M | OICP |
| VER ID REQ | 5 | Version Identification for the Request | 2-an | M | OICP |
| VER ID RESP | 6 | Version Identification for the Response | 2-an | С | OICP |
| RT | 7 | Response Type | l-alpha | M | OSP |
| GRESP_NO | 8 | Group Response Number | 20-an | M | OSP |
| RESP_NO | 9 | Response Number | 18-an | М | SYSTEM |
| CD/TSENT | 10 | Confirmation Date and Time Sent | 17-an | М | SYSTEM |
| REP | 11 | Provider Contact Representative | 15-an | М | OSP |
| TEL NO | 12 | Telephone Number | 12-num | M | OSP |
| CHC | 13 | Coordinated Hot Cut | i-aipha | С | OSP |
| DT | 14 | Due Time | 6-an | М | OSP |
| DD | 15 | Due Date | 10-an | М - | OSP |
| TNQTY | 16 | Telephone Number Quantity | 6-num | M | OICP |
| NPQTY | 17 | Number Portability Quantity | 5-num | M | OICP |
| LNUM | 18 | Line Number corresponds to LNUM on | 5-num | С | OICP |
| | | the original Request from NSP (repeats) | | | |
| PORTED # | 19 | Ported Telephone Number (repeats) | 17-an | C | OICP |
| RCODE | 20 | Reason Code (repeats) | 2-an | С | OSP |
| RDET | 21 | Reason Code Detail (repeats) | 60-an | С | OSP |
| REMARKS | 22 | Remarks | 160-an | 0 | OSP |

4.4.3 Sample Data Elements Needed for a Single Port

To further illustrate the use of the Request and Response record, this section includes a sample of a Request to port a single number along with samples of a Confirmation, Resolution Required and Delay Response.

Sample Request Record for a Single Port.

| Field | Field # | Description | Length | Type | Sample Value |
|------------|---------|---|---------|------|-----------------------|
| NLSP | 1 | Company Code (SPID) - for New Local Service Provider | 4-an | М | PCS |
| OLSP | 2 | Company Code (SPID) - for Old Local Service Provider | 4-an | М | AWS |
| REQ_NO | 3 | Request Number | 16-an | М | 1234 |
| VER ID REQ | 4 | Version Identification | 2-an | С | blank |
| SUP | 5 | Supplement Type | l-num | C | |
| NPDI | 6 | Number Portability Direction Indicator | l-alpha | М | Α |
| RESP_NO | 7 | Response Number | 18 -an | С | blank |
| NNSP | 8 | New Network Service provider | 4-an | М | PCS |
| D/TSENT | 9 | Date and Time Sent | 17-an | М | 11-05-2000- 1150AM |
| DDD | 10 | Desired Due Date | 10-an | М | 11-05-2000 |

another. If the parties involved in a port are in two or more time zones, the port can be considered to be complex.

- Non Consecutive Numbers The port may be considered to be complex when the ordering process for
 the non-consecutive number port becomes so time intensive that compliance with the agreed upon timers
 is no longer possible.
- Time of Day (After hours or Busy Times) Any port that must be completed at a time other than normal business hours or during particularly busy times during the day can be considered to be complex due to the coordination of personnel to work during these times.
- Coordination Request from one Service Provider Service Providers may make a discretionary decision based on their internal business rules to request a coordinated port. A request of coordination is always considered a complex port.

4.4 Data Elements

This section contains the fields needed to support wireless to wireless porting requests. Timing stamps for measuring the performance of the port are not included in this record layout. It is assumed at this time that there will be a header of sorts that tracks the NICP start time and the OICP end time along with possible other important timing milestones. This header would allow systems to determine record aging without having to process the entire record. It is critical to the success of the process that all service providers use the exact same record layout. Also, the data record should be constructed in the same sequence as shown in the record layout.

The WICSG was concerned about standardized format for expressing time. Since it is possible for the parties involved to be in different time zones, it is important for time to be standardized in a way that is widely acceptable to all concerned such as UTC (Universal Time Coordinated).

4.4.1 Porting Request Record

The information on the Porting Request Record is populated by the NSP from either their own internal systems or through data entered directly into NICP. In the table below, the values in the "Length" column are, "an" for alphanumeric, alpha, and "num" for numeric. The values in the Type column are "M" for mandatory, "C" for conditional and "O" for optional. When "NSP" is specified as the Data Source, it is assumed that either the NSP's systems will generate the information fed to the NICP or the information will manually entered into the NICP. When the Data Source is "SYSTEM", it is assumed that the NICP will generate the required information.

| Field | Field # | Description | Length | Type | Data Source |
|------------|---------|---|---------|------|-------------|
| NLSP | 1 | Company Code (SPID) - for New Local Service Provider | 4-an | М | NSP |
| OLSP | 2 | Company Code (SPID) - for Old Local Service Provider | 4-an | М | NSP |
| REQ_NO | 3 | Request Number | 16-an | M | SYSTEM |
| VER ID REQ | 4 | Version Identification | 2-an | C | SYSTEM |
| SUP | 5 | Supplement Type | 1-num | С | NSP |
| NPDI | 6 | Number Portability Direction Indicator | l-alpha | М | NSP |
| RESP_NO | 7 | Response Number | 18 -an | С | OSP |
| NNSP | 8 | Company Code (SPID) for the New | 4-an | М | NSP |

The NSP receives and stores the Response (Box 11). The Response is passed to the NSP B&CC system. When the NICP receives a Response, a Confirmation of Receipt (Box 10) is issued back to the OICP. The OSP should not start the NPAC process without this confirmation from the NSP. This prevents inadvertent cancellations of port requests at the NPAC due to timing errors. When the OICP receives the Confirmation of Receipt, the OSP continues with their Porting Procedures (Box 10B). If a receipt is not received within a defined time period, the OSP initiates a resolution process (Box 10A).

The Receipt of the Response (Box 11) ends the Timer (Box 17) that was started when the NICP received the OICP confirmed receipt of the Request (Box 14B). If the Timer expires (Box 15) before the receipt of the Response, an alarm will be issued from the NICP and sent to the NSP (Box 15B). The NSP will then contact the OSP for resolution (Box 16). If the Timer is not expired, then no action is required (Box 15A).

The NSP reads the Response to determine if it has been confirmed, denied or is delayed (Box 12). If the Response is "C" for Confirmation, then the NSP interprets Response Type and the Reason Code (Box 12A). If the Response Type is "D" for Delay (Box 13), then the timer is reset to allow for the extra time requested by the OSP (Box 13A). If the Response Type is "R" for Resolution Required, then the NSP initiates a resolution process (Box 13B). Depending on the reason for the Deny, the NSP determines if the port request should continue (Box 18). The NSP can either end the port (END) or correct the information and resubmit the Request (Box 2). If the Response is confirmed, then the NSP continues with the porting process (Box 12B). The NSP should not start the NPAC process without receipt of a Confirmation Response from the OSP.

4.3.2.3 Complex Ports

This section is not meant to supercede any processes or definitions of complex ports as documented in the 2nd Report on Wireless Wireline Integration⁴, but instead this section is meant to highlight complex ports in the context of the Intercarrier Communication process. Differentiating between a simple port and a complex port is important. Complex Ports require more time for data entry, increased coordination between the Service providers and/or additional time for other processes. As a result of this added complexity and coordination-intensity between the Service Providers, special rules and processes apply to Complex Ports. There are several unique issues that can add to the complexity and the time required to complete a port Request.

- Multiple Service Providers and Service Types Dependent on the port, multiple Service Providers may be involved. A customer may port several numbers from multiple OSPs. In addition, there are some Service Providers who are voice service consolidators or integrators. These Service Providers offer both wireline and wireless services. In these cases, one Service Provider may need to coordinate a port with either another consolidator of voice services or with multiple Service Providers. The need for this level of coordination would make this a complex port.
- Number of Lines The number of lines to be ported has notable impact on the complexity and
 coordination-intensity of a port. The port may be considered complex if the number of lines involved
 becomes onerous depending on whether or not the Service Provider has an automated or manual system
 of communication with other Service Providers and with the NPAC.
- Multiple Geographic Locations Considering a Major Account or a National Account it is conceivable
 that a customer requests a multi-line port across multiple geographic locations. The fact that multiple
 offices for each Service Provider are involved may cause them to pursue a project management approach
 to flash-cut the account. This increases the coordination intensity of such a port. Therefore, multiple
 geographic locations are always considered a complex port
- Multiple or Different Time Zones The problem of multiple geographic locations is compounded when these locations span time zones. Business hours in one of the time zones involved may be after-hours in

⁴ Local Number Portability Administration Working Group, published June 30, 1999